

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/955,933	COHEN, LUBA	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Deborah K. Ware	1651	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Deborah K. Ware. (3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(2) Paul Fenster. (4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 10 January 2008.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: claims of record.

Identification of prior art discussed: art of record.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

  
Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant's Representative and the Examiner discussed the prior art and the Vaya and Aviram declarations. Specifically, the Vaya reference was considered by Examiner Ware to be very detailed and specific with respect to how the insoluble licorice extract differs from the soluble licorice extract. Examiner Ware suggested during the interview that a patentability conference should be conducted to reach a final conclusion of patentability of these claims of record. Examiner Ware further asked Paul Fenster if Professor Vaya had relied upon any prior art to reach his conclusions in the declaration and Paul Fenster further acknowledged that the declaration was Professor Vaya's own testing and reasoning and that there was no prior art relied upon that he was aware of that could be applied against the claims to reach the same conclusions. Examiner Ware considers the declaration of Vaya to be persuasive over the cited prior art and will consult with the Primary Naff and suggest that a patentability conference be conducted to come to a final determination of patentability.

/Deborah K. Ware/